

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated April 8, 2005 are respectfully requested. In that Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification as failing to indicate the current state of the applications listed under the section of the specification that references provisional applications. A replacement sheet is submitted herewith with the appropriate corrections included. The Examiner is requested to approve this replacement sheet for entry into this application.

Further, in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 17, 20, 32, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Claims 17, 20, 32, and 35 have been amended to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the network manager."

In addition, the Examiner rejected Claims 14, 28, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for containing the trademark/trade name "InfiniBand." Claims 14, 28, and 45 have been amended to render the description definite.

Turning to the rejection of the claims based upon the prior art, the Examiner rejects Claims 16-18 and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wesinger, Jr. et al. The Examiner also rejects Claims 1, 2, 11, and 12 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Wesinger in combination with Cioli et al.

The Cited Prior Art:

The Wesinger reference relates to a combination of computer hardware and software that selectively allows acceptable computer transmissions to pass through it and disallows other non-acceptable computer transmissions. An access rules database provides access to the network and determines which connections will be allowed and which connections will be denied. The access rules database contains an allow portion and a deny portion. The allow and deny portions specify not only what users are allowed access, but also when such access is allowed to occur and which users are authorized.

The Cioli reference relates to a method for filtering a plurality of packets received by a switch having a set of known connections. Information regarding known connections for the switch is maintained, and packets that do not correspond to one of the known connections are filtered.

The Examiner's Arguments:

The Examiner rejects Claims 16-18 and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Wesinger reference. The Examiner argues that Wesinger discloses a system for controlling access to a network that contains two components: a first component that receives an indication that a node connected to the routing device is authorized to transmit communications through the network and a second component that transmits through the network communications received from the node as long as a criterion indicating to not transmit such communications has not occurred.

Next, the Examiner rejects Claims 1, 2, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wesinger in view of Cioli. The Examiner argues that Wesinger discloses a system for receiving from a network manager an indication that a node connected to the network is authorized to transmit communications using a destination address, receiving from the node communications using the destination address, transmitting the received communication through the network, and upon occurrence of a criterion indicating to not transmit communications of the node through the network, suppressing the transmission of the communication using a destination address that is subsequently received from the node. The Examiner argues that Cioli discloses a packet filtering switching system that allows packets to be forwarded based on known connections, shared network, and identified path.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Applicants' Amendments and Arguments:

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 16, and 31. In view of the amendments made to Claims 1, 16, and 31, the arguments will be directed towards both the Wesinger and Cioli references.

The Wesinger reference discloses a method for authorizing requested connections by a user. Once a requested connection has been authorized, the user is allowed to transmit communications through the requested connection. See Wesinger at column 15, lines 19-45. However, Wesinger fails to disclose a method for registering a user with the network after the user has been authorized to transmit communications through the network. Instead, Wesinger only mentions authorizing a user to transmit communications through the network.

The Cioli reference discloses a method for filtering a plurality of packets received by a switch having a set of known connections. Cioli fails to disclose a method for registering a user with the network after the user has been authorized to transmit communications through the network.

The present claimed invention of independent Claims 1, 16, and 31, in contrast, discloses "receiving an indication that the node connected to the switch is registered with the network manager." Claims 1, 16, and 31 have been amended to indicate both the authorization and the registration of a node with the network. The authorization and the registration of a node with the network represent two distinct, separate processes. In particular, Claims 1, 16, and 31 have been amended to recite, among other limitations, a method for "receiving an indication that the node connected to the switch is registered with the network manager." Both Wesinger and Cioli fail to disclose such a method. For at least this reason, Claims 16 and 31 are patentable over Wesinger, and Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Wesinger and Cioli.

The Wesinger reference also discloses a method for determining which connections will be allowed in a network. Wesinger discloses an access rules database having an allow portion and a deny portion for determining if a connection will be allowed. See Wesinger at column 15, lines 27-45. However, Wesinger fails to disclose a method for filtering communications based on information contained in a header associated with the communications. Instead, Wesinger discloses filtering communications based on an access rules database that is separate from the communications.

The Cioli reference discloses a method for filtering a plurality of packets received by a switch having a set of known connections. Cioli fails to disclose a method for filtering communications based on information contained in a header associated with the communications. Although Cioli mentions the filtering of communications, Cioli fails to mention the use of information contained in a header associated with the communications.


The present claimed invention of independent Claims 1, 16, and 31, in contrast, discloses "filtering communications based on information contained in a header associated with the communications." Claims 1, 16, and 31 have been amended to recite, among other limitations, a method for "filtering communications based on information contained in a header associated with the communications." Both Wesinger and Cioli fail to disclose such a method. For at least this reason, Claims 16 and 31 are patentable over Wesinger, and Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Wesinger and Cioli.

Since independent Claims 1, 16, and 31 are allowable, the claims that depend on Claims 1, 16, and 31 are likewise allowable. For at least this reason, Claims 17, 18, 32, and 33 are patentable over Wesinger, and Claims 2, 11, and 12 are patentable over the combination of Wesinger and Cioli.

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are patentable over the cited art. The applicant accordingly requests reconsideration of the application and a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8000.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Date: 5/12/05



Chun Ng
Registration No. 36,878

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000